CLO HOUS PISTRICT COURG RORTHERY DISTOR TX FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF TEXAS

2013 NOV - 1 PM 1: 09

)	2010110.
Joe Hunsinger)	DEPUTY CLERK N
Plaintiff Pro-Se'	,	Case No:
V)	3-13CV4405-G
AMERICAN CORADIUS)	-
INTERNATIONAL LLC. and)	Civil Rights Violation Complaint
BILL ME LATER, INC.)	Trial By Jury Demanded

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Comes now the Plaintiff Joe Hunsinger:

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. (FDCPA), the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act, Chapter 392 (TDCPA) and the Texas Business and Commerce code, Subchapter E, Chapter 17, (DTPA), which prohibit debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices. At all times hereinafter mentioned, The Plaintiff is a resident of Dallas County State of Texas. From here forward Joe Hunsinger, will be known as the Plaintiff.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1

Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(d) and which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy" and 28 USC §1331. Plaintiff is a consumer and Defendants are a debt collector as defined in TFC 392.001(6). Chapter 392 of the Texas Finance Code (TFC) sets forth provisions governing the behavior of debt collectors in the act of collecting debts from consumer debtors. The Defendant AMERICAN CORADIUS INTERNATIONAL, LLC (hereafter know as Defendant # 1) is a third party debt collector and conducts business in the state of Texas and is located at 2420 Sweet Home Rd Ste 150, Amherst, New York 14228. Defendant was engaged in the act of debt collection, as defined by the TFC

392.001(5) when it called the Plaintiff on his telephone and in their collection letter. Defendant is also a "debt collector" as defined by 15 USC 1692a(6) and by the Texas Finance Code §392.001(2) and has a surety bond with the Secretary of the State of Texas.

2

BILL ME LATER INC. (hereafter known as Defendant # 2) is a national banking institution and also conducts business in the state of Texas and as such is governed under the FDCPA 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. and by the Texas Finance Code Ann. 392.001(6). Defendant # 2 has also violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 USC §227.

3

Plaintiff brings this action to the facts from the collection activities of the Defendants on an account or alleged account that <u>violated the civil rights</u> of the Plaintiff and the law as outlined in the FDCPA 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. and the TFC chapter 392.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

4

Plaintiff is a consumer as defined by the FDCPA, 15 USC 1692a(3), the Texas Business and Commerce Code section §17.50(a)(1), and Texas Finance Code §392.001(1). Defendants #1 and #2 have attempted to collect a debt as defined in the FDCPA 15 USC 1692(a)(5) and the TFC Section 392.001(2) and in debt collection as defined in the TFC Section 392.001(5). Defendant #3 has violated the TFC Section 392.306.

5

Defendants have also violated the TDCPA, and the DTPA.

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

6

Defendant #1 mailed a collection letter, dated November 2, 2012, to the Plaintiff.

7

On or about 11-6-2012 the Plaintiff received a phone call from Defendant #1 who was attempting to collect a debt from Plaintiff. This was the initial telephone communication Plaintiff had from Defendant #1.

8

Defendant # 1 also made a second phone call to Plaintiff on 11-12-2013, in an attempt to collect on a consumer debt. On both occasions the Plaintiff clearly identified himself as being the person whom he was looking for. Defendant # 1 collection agent Andrew refused to give the Plaintiff the company's mailing address. Plaintiff then spoke with Aaron, a supervisor, who did not give Plaintiff his Mini Miranda warnings and attempted to collect a debt from the Plaintiff.

9

Plaintiff sent Defendant # 1 a certified letter disputing and requesting debt validation, dated 12-4-2012 but received the validation from Defendant # 2, the original creditor, dated 12-9-2012. A second debt dispute and request for validation of the debt was sent on 2-13-2013. Again, the original creditor mailed validation of the debt to the Plaintiff, on 3-12-2013.

10

On 3-5-2012, 3-6-2012, and on 3-11-2012 the Plaintiff received collection calls on account ending in # 8932 from another debt collection company attempting to collect on said account. This happened within the 30 day validation period. Plaintiff did not receive any debt validation from Defendant # 1. Defendant sent the validation request to the original creditor each time the Plaintiff sent in his dispute and validation request.

11

To date Defendant #1 has failed to obtain verification of the debt and provide it to the Plaintiff.

12

Defendant # 2 had another debt collector call the Plaintiff within the 30 day validation period three times in an attempt to collect a debt, on 3-5-2013,3-6-2013, and 3-11-2013. In their first attempt to collect a debt from the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff clearly identified himself as the person who they were looking for.

13

Plaintiff send Defendant # 1 a certified letter disputing and requesting verification of the debt they had called about. To date Defendant # 1 has failed to obtain verification of the debt and provide it to the Plaintiff.

14

Defendant # 2 is creditor and has participated in collection activity defined by TFC 392.001(6). Defendant # 2 attempted to collect a debt from the Plaintiff by placing hundreds and hundreds of phone calls to him on his cell phone by using an automated telephone dialing system(ATDS) and/or by using artificial or pre-recorded messages for the purposes of collecting a debt. When the Plaintiff answered the calls from the Defendant he would hear a moment of brief silence until a live representative would connect on the line.

15

The calls from the Defendant placed to the Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 USC 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

16

Defendant # 2 hired Defendant # 1 and another debt collection company to collect on the account in question, knowing full well that Defendant # 1 had repeatedly violated the laws of the TFC and the FDCPA put in place to protect consumers in the past.

17

Prior to the filing of this case litigation the Plaintiff had attempted but was unable to negotiate an amicable settlement agreement out of court. Plaintiff with no option other than file the case before this honorable court.

CAUSE OF ACTION ONE AGAINST DEFENDANT #1 UNDER FDCPA AND TFC

18

Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation.

19

Defendant # 1 violated the 15 USC 1692e(10) by refusing to give the Plaintiff the mailing address of the debt collection company calling him on or around 11-12-2012. Defendant # 1 also violated 15 USC 1692e(11) by not giving the Plaintiff his "Mini Miranda" warnings.

20

Defendant # 1 violated TFC Section 392.304(a) by refusing to give the Plaintiff the mailing address of the debt collection company calling him on or around 11-12-2012. Defendant # 1

also violated TFC Section 392.304(5)(A) and (B) by not giving the Plaintiff his "Mini Miranda" warnings.

21

Defendant # 1 violated the TFC Section 392.202(b) and (e) by not informing the Plaintiff one of three options the law mandates debt collectors to do when they receive a dispute and debt validation request. And they were also mandated to send information informing and stating: Deny Accuracy, Admit Accuracy, or State They Need More Time. Plaintiff did not receive anything from Defendant # 1.

22

Defendant # 1 violated TFC Section 392.304(19) when Plaintiff received *three* collection calls from another debt collection company attempting to collect a debt from said account within the debt validation period. These calls where placed to the plaintiff on 3-5-2013, 3-6-2013 and 3-11-2013.

23

Defendant # 1 violated 1692g(b) from its collection activities and communication during the 30 day period, where they were inconsistent with the disclosure of the consumer's right to dispute the debt.

CAUSE OF ACTON TWO

AGAINST DEFENDANT # UNDER THE FDCPA AND THE TFC

24

Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation.

25

Defendant # 2 violated the FDCPA 1692d(5) and the TFC Section 392.302(4) by causing Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly, calling the plaintiff repeatedly, day after day several times a day. Hundreds and hundreds of phone calls were placed to the Plaintiff by Defendant # 2 in a matter only a few months.

26

Defendant violated the TFC Section 392.306 by having actual knowledge of and using an independent debt collector who repeatedly and continuously engages in the acts or practices that are prohibited by the TFC.

27

Defendant # 2 violated TFC Section 392.304(19) when Plaintiff received *three* collection calls from another debt collection company attempting to collect a debt from said account within the debt validation period. These calls where placed to the plaintiff on 3-6-2013 and 3-11-2013. Defendant #2 was notified by Defendant #1 that the account in question had a dispute and debt validation request made by the Plaintiff which Defendant #1 received on 2-15-2013, in turn they notified Defendant #2. Thus Defendant #2 sent Plaintiff the validation of the debt, dated 3-1-2013. A validation of under the FDCPA is only valid if the debt collector obtains the validation from the original creditor and sends it out to the consumer making the request.

CAUSE OF ACTION THREE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT UNDER TCPA

28

Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation.

29

Without prior consent the Defendant contacted the Plaintiff by means of Automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages at a cell phone in violation of 47 USC 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

30

Defendants placed calls to Plaintiff's cell phone using prerecorded voice knowing that it lacked consent to call his number. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 USC 227(b)(3)(C).

31

As a result of each call made in negligent violating of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 USC 227(B)(3)(B).

32

As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1500 pursuant to 47 USC 227(B)(3)(B) and 47 USC 227(B)(3)(C).

CAUSE OF ACTION FOUR AGAINST THE DEFENDANT UNDER TDCPA, TEXAS FINANCE CODE, TDTPA, AND THE TEXAS BUSINESS COMMERCIAL CODE

33

Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation.

34

A violation of the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act is a deceptive trade practice under the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, and is actionable under the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act. Texas Finance Code §392.404(a). Defendant #1 and #2violated Texas Business Commercial Code § 17.50(h). Adjudging that Defendant violated the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Tex. Bus. Com. Code, Chapter 17, Subchapter E.

35

WHEREFORE, the Defendant has violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Plaintiff demands judgment for their violations of the FDCPA plus additional judgment from their violations of the Texas Finance Code and the TCPA, plus all cost of this action along with punitive damages as the court may allow, an apology for trashing Plaintiffs civil rights, award Plaintiff actual damages, pursuant to Tex. Bus. Com. Code § 17.50(h), awarding Plaintiff three times actual damages, pursuant to Texas Business Commercial Code § 17.50(h). Along with Private Attorney General fees as prescribed by law Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2nd 107, 113 (#d Cir. 1991), 15 U.S.C. sec. 1692k(a)(3), (see Zagorski v. Midwest Billing Services, Inc., F. 3d---(1997 WL 695401, 7th Cir.) or 128F. 3d 1164 (7th Cir., 1997), along with all other relief to which Plaintiff may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted November \, 2013.

Joe Hunsinger Plaintiff Pro-Se

7216 C.F. Hawn Frwy. Dallas, Texas 75217

Joe75217@gmail.com

214-682-7677

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the forgoing complaint/summons vs. AMERICAN CORADIUS INTERNATIONAL LLC. and BILL ME LATER, LLC. will be served upon the Defendants registered agents with affidavit of service by Process Service Receipt to be submitted to the Clerk of the Court.

November , 2013.

Joe Hunsinger Plaintiff Pro-Se 7216 C.F. Hawn Frwy. Dallas, Texas 75217 Joe75217@gmail.com 214-682-7677

Case 3:13-cv-04405-G-BN Document 1 Filed 11/01/13 Page 9 of 9 PageID 9

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

mie er in deenet bliett: (BEE I	TIBING CHOING ON THE REVE	AGE OF THE FORM.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	ADILIO INTERNATIONA	N. I.I.O. and
Joe Hunsinger			BILL ME LATER	RADIUS INTERNATIONA , INC.	AL LLC. and
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff C	ALLAS	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	
(E	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY)
		1	2013 TE: IN LA	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
		1 1 1	OV LAND		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Numbe	er)	Attention's GOUTE		
Pro Se'		QL FRY	L CITIZENSHIP OF I	3-13CV4	44U5-G
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only) NO	II. CITIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government l	Not a Party)		I Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	rincipal Place 🔲 4 🗇 4
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citizen of Another State	J 2	Principal Place 🗇 5 🗇 5
Defendant	•	p of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	
	,	,,	Citizen or Subject of a	J 3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Or	.1.3	Foreign Country		
CONTRACT	Place an "X" in One Box Of		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	☐ 610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	☐ 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 620 Other Food & Drug	423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust
130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpractice	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY/RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander Slander	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 400 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Injury Product	☐ 650 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud	Y Safety/Health ☐ 690 Other		490 Cable/Sat TV
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment		371 Truth in Lending	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 380 Other Personal	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damage	Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	1 Todact Liability	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment 443 Housing/	Sentence Habeas Corpus:	791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	894 Energy Allocation Act
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare	☐ 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION	20 020 7009	☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Other		n	Under Equal Access
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	☐ 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee		to Justice
	Other	533 Trison Condition	☐ 465 Other Immigration		950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
			Actions		State Statetes
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)		1		Appeal to District
▼1 Original □ 2 R	emoved from 3	Appellate Court	Reopened anoth	sferred from Grant	rict 7 Judge from
·	1 15 1100 1600	tute under which you are	filing (Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of ca	iuse:			
	VIOLATIONS EN	ACTED BY CONGR	RESS AND THE TEXAS LI	EGISLATURE	
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.			JURY DEMAND:	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE (7	DOCKET NUMBER	
<u> </u>					
SIGNATURE OF ALTONIAET OF RECORD					
11/01/2013					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE